

REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the various reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Action.

These claims have all been amended in a manner in which it is submitted satisfies the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Objections

Claims 13, 16 and 17 stand objected to because of the informalities set forth in numbered paragraph 3 on pages 2 and 3 of the Action. These claims have all been amended according to the suggestions of the Examiner and are believed to now satisfy all of the Examiner's objections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Pub. No. 2002/0035497 to Mazereeuw et al. in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,469,954 to Maehara.

For the reasons set forth hereafter, it is submitted that claims 8 and 12, as amended, now patentability distinguish over the prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 13 was stated to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 14 was only objected to

as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15-17 were stated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and rewritten in independent form.

Claim 13 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections. Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form and claims 15-17 have been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections and have been rewritten in independent form. It is submitted that claims 13-17 are now allowable.

Patentability of Claims 8 and 12 As Amended

Claims 8 and 12 have been amended to further recite that the invention supplies power to arbitrary power systems in the same power network. Support for these amendments is found in the specification at page 5, line 19 thru page 6, line 7. The purpose of the amendments is to make it clear that the plurality of generating facilities according to the present invention are generating facilities for supplying electric power which is sent to a customer via the same electric power network.

Accordingly, the invention as now defined in amended claims 8 and 12 relates to power generating facilities in which the output follows the load demand. The invention can adequately manage a plurality of power generating facilities which are connected to the same electric power network. With the invention, under an environment where the required load fluctuates and the output of the respective power generating facilities fluctuates, even when an unforeseen circumstance happens to one of the power generating facilities, is still possible to manage the plural generating facilities to produce a sufficient amount of power.

With respect to the cited references, Mazereeuw et al. relates to a system and method for utility enterprise management and electric power transmission and distribution. Mazereeuw et al. discloses a technique for making certain that the voltage value and the current value remain constant. The Maehara '954 patent relates to a movable substation and the system connection in the movable substation. Maehara discloses a technique for installing the substation where no power supply for operating and controlling the equipment is available. The device of Maehara incorporates a generator 16 having a prime mover coupled therewith for operating and controlling the equipment in the substation.

In rejecting claims 8 and 12, the Examiner stated that all of the limitations of claims 8 and 12 are disclosed in Mazereeuw et al. except that it "fails to teach that the substations are capable of generating power". To supply this deficiency, the Examiner then cited Maehara as teaching analogous art with a substation capable of generating power and stated that it therefore should would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Maehara with the teachings of Mazereeuw et al. to arrive at the invention as defined in claims 8 and 12.

The generator 16 shown in Maehara is used merely to activate the substation facility but is not connected to the electrical power network. This is shown for example in col. 2, lines 28-36 of Maehara where it is stated "When the transformer 6A is energized, from the main transformer 6A..., thereby allowing the normally closed contact 19 to be opened (disconnecting the generator 16) and the normally open contact 18 to be closed, and the electric power is thereafter supplied from the transformer 6A."

Neither Mazereeuw et al. nor Maehara disclose or even suggest plural power facilities being connected to the same electric power network, which is an essential feature of the present invention as now defined in claims 8 and 12.

In addition, there is no suggestion in either of the Mazereeuw et al. or Maehara references of combining their teachings in the manner done so by the Examiner. Even if the references are combined, however, they still do not render Applicant's invention as now set forth in claims 8 and 12 on patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. NIP-219-03).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Gene W. Stockman
Registration No. 21,021

GWS/cmd
(703) 684-1120